

| | | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/679,343 | MATSUO ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Tiffany A. Fetzner | 2859 | |

All Participants:
Status of Application: Amended

 (1) Ex. Tiffany A. Fetzner.

(3) _____.

 (2) Attorney Susan A. Wolffe reg. No. 33.568.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 12 April 2005
Time: 10am
Type of Interview:
☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.
Rejection(s) discussed:
See Continuation Sheet
Claims discussed:
Claims 1, 4, 6-8, and 12-16, and the numerous grammatical / formal problems with the claims as filed in the January 18th 2005 a if left without correction.
Prior art documents discussed:
None
Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet
Part III.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of rejections discussed: 112 concerns in the claims as a result of the January 18th 2005 Amendment, unless corrected by examiner's amendment due to the fact that the original specification and claims have numerous grammatical, and translational errors which make the specification / claims exceedingly difficult to read. The examiner requested that applicant submit a replacement specification and proposed numerous grammatical corrections to make the claims more readable for one of ordinary skill in the art whose primary language is English.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted applicant's representative on March 4th 2005, April 7th 2005, and April 12th 2005 to discuss the examiner's concerns with the claims and specification as of January 18th 2005 because of the numerous and excessive grammatical problems with the translated specification and claims. On March 4th 2005 Nothing was resolved by the applicant's representative relayed the examiner's concerns to applicant. On April 7th 2005 the examiner requested permission to make an examiner's amendment to the claims to place them in a more readable form, and presented a series of proposed specification corrections to applicant. In the telephonic interview of April 12th 2005, the examiner was informed that the proposed examiner's amendments to the pending claims were acceptable to applicant, and that applicant was submitting a replacement Specification including the grammatical corrections suggested by the examiner. Additionally applicant agreed to submit, t New grammatically corrected figures 7, and 8 so that the steps of the method would be clearly readable. The examiner was thanked for the extensive amount of time and effort provided in furthering the instant application, toward an acceptable format in order to place the application in condition for allowance. .